

12/16/69

Dear Harold,

I am enclosing ~~XX~~ a copy of my second letter to Fisher and the reply which I never expected to get. Of course, this must be kept confidential. I very much need your advice.

In my letter, I tried to "lay it on the line" to him, giving him every opportunity to defend himself and the Panel. This letter needs little explaining for it is not elliptical like my first to all of the doctors.

His answer is something else. Often, I do not know what to make of it. In the first paragraph we learn that all of the doctors now know about my stand (this should secure that I get no info from Moritz). Notice that Carnes didn't answer Fisher's letter. Judging from the dates, I now can see that Carnes' second letter came after he received a copy of mine to Fisher; this probably explains his coldness. However, his failure to reply to Fisher indicates to me the possibility that he now realizes what he disclosed to me and is afraid. Just a guess, of course but I do not put it beyond what is conceivable with these men.

In the second paragraph, Fisher exposes himself for the snake I had judged him to be from his first letter. Note "I would point out that it was not our charge to nit pick with the details of the original pathologists' report, but to determine whether the evidence in the photographs, x-rays, ect. did or did not support the conclusions reached by the Warren Commission." Now look at his first letter, the answer to my first question. I believe I originally told you I thought this was bull and here is the proof. In the next sentence, he at least admits that there were differences, even though he terms them "minor." The last sentence in that paragraph is interesting and in a way is a commentary on what a fraud the Panel was.

The fourth paragraph is on the significance of the neck fragments and the entrance-exit holes. Notice that he does not dispute what I had written him--he merely cautions me as to what sources I should use. Also notice the last sentence there--it is as if he is telling me that the bullet which passed through the neck (as he thinks) was deformed, possibly to the extent that only a portion of it passed out the front of the neck.

His last paragraph raised my gander--his little stab at us "nit pickers." He trusts I will not join their numbers--as if I should join among men who will do what he has done!

I feel that I must reply to this letter. It seems that we can partially break him down, we already got the change in his answer on the purpose of the Panel. However, this has become so deep that I seek your help and advice for I do not want to ruin this chance. Here is what I have planned to write in response; welcome your comments and suggestions or just things which you would like me to say.

I want to bring out to Fisher, from the last sentence 2nd. para., that they really "key observation" is not that the bullet came from behind, but what kind of bullets came from behind? Is there reason to believe that some bullets came from the front especially after seeing the Zapruder film and Nix film as he did? Did the fact that the President is thrown forcefully backwards have no meaning to

the Panel? These are important questions which I have no reservations about asking. They have to be asked, in fact, and he should be given the chance to answer them for they could affect his personal and professional integrity. He knows this and he knows that I intend to publish it although he may not know the extent of what I intend for publication.

His fourth paragraph is the one which I am most anxious to reply to. I would like to present him with some authoritative sources which I am going to use in my text. For instance, Lemoyne Snyder cites a case in his book Homicide Investigation. Snyder is an extremely respected criminologist who Fisher cannot argue or accuse of writing "tommyrot." The case concerns a man found shot dead ~~with~~^{by} a rifle. There were two suspects--one had a rifle which shot jacketed military bullets and the other had one which fired soft-nosed lead ammo. X-rays of the body revealed numerous lead flecks throughout the chest which, according to Snyder, is a strong indication that the soft-nosed ammo was used. I'd like to present this to Fisher in reference to the neck X-rays. I have asked Dick for good references and my search still continues.

I would also like to lay it on the line about what the Panel info does to the integrity of the autopsy surgeons. Point out the contradictions in the sworn testimony such as the absence of metal in the neck and the failure to ascertain traces of the anterior wound. Then cite the Panel info and flatly ask, "Doesn't this make perjurers out of the autopsy surgeons/" and "Is this a little more crucial than 'nit picking'?" Of course, what is Fisher going to say? I'd at least like to get some kind of acknowledgment from him.

I'm really excited by this and I desperately don't want to muffle things up.

Anxiously await your reply.

Howard